

COMMITTEE ON BUDGET AND INTERDEPARTMENTAL RELATIONS
ANNUAL REPORT 2004-05
November 8, 2005

This report concerns the actions and policy deliberations of the 2004-05 Budget Committee.

Routine recommendations to the central administration.

The committee enjoyed a constructive working relationship with the administration. Most disagreements between the committee and the administration were resolved through the process of reconsideration and, in several instances, through discussion. The administration accepted the committee's final recommendations concerning faculty appointments, salary, step, and rank in all but five cases; of those, three concerned step or rank, and two concerned salary only. During 2004-05, the Budget Committee was able to handle most cases expeditiously. The committee has found the new HRMS case-tracking system useful; it enables departments, deans, and administrators to determine where in the review process any delays are occurring. We encourage all of those involved in academic personnel review to use this source of information.

During the 2004-05 review of requests for faculty positions, departments, schools, and directors of new initiatives asked for a total of 126 positions. The central administration requested that the Budget Committee make recommendations for a total of 65 searches, with at least 80% of these positions restricted to the nontenured level. In making its recommendations, the Budget Committee took into account a number of considerations, including each unit's programmatic needs, the relation of its actual size to its target size, and its faculty's workload. The Budget Committee's initial recommendations were adjusted during the spring in light of discussions with administrators and in light of new information about separations and ongoing searches.

Salary issues.

The campus continues to face challenges in recruiting and retaining faculty members, but it is our impression that Berkeley continues to do well on both fronts. This success, however, often requires Berkeley to offer salaries that are considerably above the scale salaries paid to Berkeley's faculty, and this has led to serious inequities within departments. More generally, the committee is very concerned about problems arising from the widening gap between the University's salary scale and the salaries paid to faculty members at universities that are Berkeley's peers. During 2004-05, the committee worked with the administration on refining the implementation of a 2002 policy concerning salaries for untenured faculty members, and on reviewing cases for salary increases recommended under the Targeted Decoupling Initiative, a three-year program whose final year will be 2005-06. But it is clear that the campus needs a broader and more coherent plan for faculty compensation, and the committee has strongly supported the work of the Senate/administration committees that were appointed in 2003-04 and 2004-05 to develop such a plan. It is also clear that no plan will be any better than

the salary survey data that support its implementation, and the committee is hopeful that the campus's new source for data will be more useful than the one it has used thus far.

The plan for faculty compensation currently under consideration by the administration offers a new way of thinking about salary equity: across campus, faculty members of equal accomplishment should be at the same rank and step; within disciplines, faculty members at the same rank and step should have equal salaries; and Berkeley should increase the salaries of faculty members so that they approximate what peer institutions pay those who are at the same career stage in the same discipline. Accepting what is, in effect, a variety of pay scales for different disciplines is not easy: it requires abandoning the long-cherished campus-wide ideal of equal pay for equally meritorious accomplishment. The University has already taken steps in this direction by adopting separate scales for Law and for Engineering and Business; now, the Budget Committee believes, Berkeley must move further in this direction if it is to have a coherent policy that will allow it to continue to succeed in recruitment and retention and, over time, to reduce inequities within disciplines.

At the same time, we note the dangers of moving in this direction: some faculty members (for example, many in the humanities and social sciences) will receive pay considerably lower than that of other campus colleagues, while working as hard and productively as their better-paid colleagues. It will be important for the campus to do everything it can to make life at Berkeley equally rewarding for all of the members of its distinguished faculty, whether the rewards take the form of salary or of other desiderata.

Teaching issues.

Because the Budget Committee sees the teaching records of faculty members across campus, it has a unique, albeit limited, perspective on several issues about teaching. One concerns campus resources available to faculty members who want to improve the effectiveness of their teaching. It is clear from the records of faculty members who have turned to the Office of Education Development that the OED can help faculty members become more effective teachers, but we are concerned that the OED is understaffed and underfunded. We hope that this campus resource will receive more support in the future.

The second issue about teaching concerns the teaching loads of faculty members in various disciplines. Although many faculty members normally teach four courses per year, others routinely do considerably less classroom teaching. While some variation is to be expected—the campus must be sensitive to normal practice in various disciplines at other leading universities, and the demands of nonclassroom teaching and mentoring may vary from one discipline to another—we worry that some variations may be unfair and may also distort FTE allocation. We hope that the campus will try to collect and analyze information about teaching loads in various disciplines, and that it will try to reduce disparities wherever possible, though of course taking into account normal disciplinary practice elsewhere, along with the varying demands of nonclassroom teaching.

Search cuts.

In the fall 2004 semester, several deans proposed cutting previously allocated searches in order to achieve mandatory permanent reductions in their decanal budgets. After consultation with the Budget Committee, the central administration gave its approval to several of these proposals; we are pleased that the administration also agreed in effect to move the permanent cuts to the campus level and to restore the cut searches as soon as possible. We hope that with returning budgetary health, the campus will not again need to consider such extreme measures, but the committee has recommended that if the campus ever again faces a need to make drastic cuts, it take authorized searches off the table when it asks deans to reduce their budgets. We have also recommended to the administration that if search cuts must again be contemplated in order to meet reductions to the campus's budget, decisions about cutting searches should be made comparatively across campus, that is, in the same way that decisions about authorizing them are made. Responsible allocation of a limited and precious resource like faculty FTE must be carried out in this way so that Berkeley can satisfy itself that it is meeting its very most pressing needs. For just the same sort of reason, the committee believes, decisions about taking allocated resources away from schools and departments must be reached by making comparative judgments across campus. After all, the search of lowest priority in one decanal unit may be a higher priority than a number of other searches across campus.

Measures to streamline academic personnel review.

This year, the Budget Committee has worked on several ways to streamline the academic personnel review process while maintaining and enhancing the care with which review is carried out. Working closely with the administration and with staff representatives from across the campus, we have advocated several ways to clarify and simplify the forms and paperwork involved in case preparation. The new forms will be tried out in several departments during 2005-06, and we hope that they will be widely used the following year. The Budget Committee has also proposed a different way of coordinating its work with that of the deans in routine cases for merit increases; this proposal will be tried out during 2005-06. Finally, the committee has supported efforts on campus to move student evaluation of teaching online; this will do more to reduce the amount of staff time consumed by case preparation than any other single streamlining measure could. The committee believes that online evaluation must offer departments and faculty members the same flexibility they now enjoy in creating course evaluation forms, and that it must be designed so that it can generate reports that will be useful in academic review.

Budget Committee collaboration with other Senate committees.

During 2004-05, the Budget Committee had several welcome opportunities to work with the Division and with other Senate committees. With the encouragement of Senate Chair Robert Knapp, the committee prepared an "Introduction to the Budget Committee," which is posted on the committee's page on the Senate web site. This introduction provides a brief history of the Committee, explains the Committee's responsibilities, and sketches the academic personnel review process at Berkeley; it is aimed at members of Berkeley's faculty who want information about the committee's mandate and

functioning. The Budget Committee also worked with the Committee on the Status of Women and Ethnic Minorities, making several contributions to SWEM's guide for junior faculty members and discussing ways in which the two committees could usefully share their perspectives on issues of common concern. With the help of the Senate chair, members of the Committee on Student Diversity and Academic Development and the Budget Committee jointly urged the administration to encourage chairs and deans to report and analyze faculty members' outreach efforts and their efforts to improve academic outcomes for students who are members of underrepresented minority groups. The Committee on Committees and the Budget Committee conferred fruitfully about ways in which Berkeley's representation on the systemwide University Committee on Academic Personnel could be enhanced.

Diversity of the committee's membership.

The Budget Committee believes that it is important for its membership to be diverse; its diversity should include diversity of disciplines and of gender and ethnicity. The Committee on Committees shares this ideal, and over the past few years COMS has worked hard to fulfill it, though with less success in some dimensions than COMS and the Budget Committee have hoped for. This may in part be because women and members of underrepresented minority groups often carry disproportionately heavy service burdens, which may (understandably) make them reluctant to take on additional service. We would like to take this opportunity to say that over the years, most members of the Budget Committee have found their service on the committee to be unusually rewarding; even those who have carried heavy service loads in their school, division, or college have been glad they said 'yes' to a invitation from COMS to serve on the Budget Committee.

The Budget Committee wishes to thank Jean Fitz, Lana Buffington, Leori Gill, Jan Green, Aimee Larsen, and Flora Miranian for their exceptional work during 2004-05. Their high standards, their invaluable collective memory and experience, and their willingness to put in long hours are truly remarkable, and we express our sincerest admiration and appreciation for all that they do.

David Bogy (Mechanical Engineering), July 2004
Janet Broughton, Chair, 2004-05 (Philosophy)
Timothy Hampton (French, Comparative Literature)
James Hunt (Civil and Environmental Engineering)
Russell Jones (Plant and Microbial Biology)
Victoria Kahn (English, Comparative Literature)
Patrick Kirch (Anthropology)
Stephen Palmer (Psychology, Cognitive Science)
Richard Saykally (Chemistry), August 2004 – June 2005
Carl Shapiro (Business, Economics)